

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8 have been cancelled. Claims 7 and 9-11 remain pending in the present application. Claim 7 has been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed.

The undersigned attorney would like to thank Examiners Nguyen and Scheuermann for the courtesies extended to him during the personal interview on January 5, 2006. At the interview, Claim 7 as well as the references to Meyer and Sugai et al. were discussed. No agreement was reached.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 7, 9, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer (U.S. Patent No. 3,355,611) in view of Sugai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,313). The Examiner alleges that the combination discloses Applicants' invention.


Claim 7 has been amended. Claim 7 further defines that a grinding wheel or cutting wheel is provided. The grinding wheel or cutting wheel is positioned at a desired angle with respect to the axis. A determination of the depth of cut of the grinding wheel or cutting wheel is determined. The grinding wheel or cutting wheel is plunged into the top surface of the brush blank. An arcuate spring retention plunge is formed in the top surface in a plane traverse to the axis to have a slope relative to the axis.

The art relied on by the Examiner, specifically Meyer in view of Sugai et al., fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' invention. The Meyer reference relied on by the Examiner illustrates a groove 12 which receives a clip 22. The clip interlocks into the groove by an interference fit relationship such as dovetail undercut or the like. See,

column 2, lines 27-35. Accordingly, Meyer fails to disclose or suggest a plunge in top surface 16. Further, Meyer neither discloses nor suggests the providing of a grinding wheel or cutting wheel, the positioning of the wheel, or determining of the depth of the cut. The combination with Sugai et al. fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' invention. Sugai et al. illustrates a cutout on the side of the brush box. Further, Sugai et al. fails to disclose or suggest the positioning and determination of depth of the cut of the grinding wheel or cutting wheel as claimed by Applicants. Thus, the combination cited by the Examiner fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' invention. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claim 7 to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, Claims 9-11 which depend from Claim 7, are patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,



W.R. Duke Taylor
Reg. No. 31,906
Attorney for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600

Date: January 18, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 0275S-000510/COB